		<b>3</b>		
1	TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW I	LLP		
2	Susan M. Spaeth (State Bar No. 142652) smspaeth@townsend.com			
3	Matthew R. Hulse (State Bar No. 209490) mrhulse@townsend.com			
	Kyle Vos Strache (State Bar No. 251807)			
4	kvosstrache@townsend.com 379 Lytton Avenue			
5	Palo Alto, California 94301 Telephone: (650) 326-2400			
6	Facsimile: (650) 326-2422			
7	BECKMAN COULTER INC. Mighael C. Schiffer (State Per No. 120176)			
8	Michael C. Schiffer (State Bar No. 120176) mcschiffer@beckman.com			
9	4300 North Harbor Boulevard, M/S A-42-C Fullerton, California 92834			
10	Telephone: (714) 773-7916 Facsimile: (714) 773-7936			
11	TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW I	LLP		
12				
13				
14	Telephone: (858) 350-6100 Facsimile: (858) 350-6111			
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants BECKMAN COULTER INC. and ORCHID CELLMARK INC.			
16				
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
18	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
19	BECKMAN COULTER INC., a Delaware	Case No. 08 CV 1013 W POR		
20	corporation, and ORCHID CELLMARK INC., a Delaware corporation,	BECKMAN COULTER INC. AND ORCHID		
21	Plaintiffs,	CELLMARK INC.'S REPLY TO SEQUENOM, INC.'S COUNTERCLAIMS		
22	v.			
23	SEQUENOM, INC., a Delaware corporation,			
24	Defendant.			
25	AND DELATED COLINTED CLADA			
26	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM			
27				
28				

1 REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIMS 2 Plaintiffs and counterdefendants Beckman Coulter Inc. and Orchid Cellmark Inc. (collectively 3 "Beckman"), through undersigned counsel, respond to Defendant Sequenom, Inc.'s ("Sequenom") 4 Counterclaims to Plaintiffs' Complaint for Patent Infringement as follows: 5 THE PARTIES 6 1. Beckman is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth 7 of Defendant's allegations of paragraph 1 of Defendant's Counterclaims and therefore deny the same. 8 2. Beckman admits the allegations of paragraph 2 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 9 3. Beckman admits the allegations of paragraph 3 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 10 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 11 4. Beckman admits that Sequenom has plead its counterclaims under the Patent Laws of the 12 United States and that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1367, 13 1338(a), 2201, and 2202. Except as expressly admitted, the allegations of paragraph 4 of Defendant's 14 Counterclaims are denied. 15 5. Beckman admits the allegations of paragraph 5 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 16 6. Beckman admits the allegations of paragraph 6 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 17 **COUNT I** (Declaratory Judgment Regarding U.S. Patent No. 5,888,819) 18 19 7. Beckman incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein each of its replies to paragraphs 1 through 6 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 20 8. 21 Beckman admits that an actual controversy exists between Beckman and Sequenom as to 22 the validity and infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,888,819 ("the '819 patent"), but denies that such 23 patent is invalid and not infringed by Sequenom. 24 9. Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 9 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 25 10. Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 10 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 26 11. Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 11 of Defendant's Counterclaims. 27 /// 28 ///

1	COUNT II		
2	(Declaratory Judgment Regarding U.S. Patent No. 6,004,744)		
3	12.	Beckman incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein each of its replies to	
4	paragraphs 1	through 6 of Defendant's Counterclaims.	
5	13.	Beckman admits that an actual controversy exists between Beckman and Sequenom as to	
6	the validity and infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,004,744 ("the '744 patent"), but denies that such		
7	patent is invalid and not infringed by Sequenom.		
8	14.	Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 14 of Defendant's Counterclaims.	
9	15.	Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 15 of Defendant's Counterclaims.	
10	16.	Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 16 of Defendant's Counterclaims.	
11	COUNT III		
12		(Declaratory Judgment Regarding U.S. Patent No. 6,537,748)	
13	17.	Beckman incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein each of its replies to	
14	paragraphs 1 through 6 of Defendant's Counterclaims.		
15	18.	Beckman admits that an actual controversy exists between Beckman and Sequenom as to	
16	the validity and infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,537,748 ("the '748 patent"), but denies that such		
17	patent is invalid and not infringed by Sequenom.		
18	19.	Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 19 of Defendant's Counterclaims.	
19	20.	Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 20 of Defendant's Counterclaims.	
20	21.	Beckman denies the allegations of paragraph 21 of Defendant's Counterclaims.	
21	REPLY TO SEQUENOM'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
22	Beckman denies that Sequenom is entitled to any relief whatsoever, including the relief that		
23	Sequenom requests in its Answer and Counterclaims.		
24	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES		
25	Beckman alleges and asserts the following defenses in response to the allegations in Defendant		
26	Counterclaims.		
27	22.	Sequenom's Counterclaims fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.	
28	23.	Beckman Coulter Inc. and Orchid Cellmark Inc. reallege the allegations of their	

1	Complaint. The claims of the '819, '744, and '748 patents are valid and enforceable in all respects, and		
2	are infringed by Sequenom.		
3	DATED: August 29, 2008	TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP	
4			
5		s/ Susan M. Spaeth	
6	S	Susan M. Spaeth	
7		Matthew R. Hulse  Kyle Vos Strache	
8	3	Palo Alto, CA 94301	
9			
10		BECKMAN COULTER INC.  Michael C. Schiffer	
11	4	H300 North Harbor Boulvard, M/S A-42-C Fullerton, CA 92843	
12			
13		TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP ris Sockel Mitrakos	
14	1	2730 High Bluff Drive, Suite 400	
		San Diego, CA 92130	
15		Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants BECKMAN COULTER INC. and	
16		ORCHID CELLMARK INC.	
17	0148/900 VI		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I hereby certify that counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served on August 29, 2008, with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rules and Administrative Policies Section 2(d). Any other counsel of record will be served by electronic mail, facsimile transmission and/or first class mail on this same date. /s/ Susan M. Spaeth\_ Susan M. Spaeth Email: smspaeth@townsend.com